

So this, I think at long last, after 200 years, brings to conclusion the disputes and the difficulties raised by this border. I hope that it will gain the unanimous approval of my colleagues.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB B. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob B. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Members in the Chamber and the staff and those in the gallery may wish to rise for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, we had mentioned the fact that the concerns of the Indian tribes in the area were a highlight of the agreement that was finally reached. As a matter of fact, we approved an amendment in full committee, which is now part of the bill, which takes into account those concerns.

Here we have a resolution issued by the Kiowa, Comanche & Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee, which, in effect, approves and supports the amendment, the language that is now in the bill that expresses our concern about the Indian tribe concerns. And it has been duly certified and rendered to our committee. I include for the RECORD that resolution:

KIOWA, COMANCHE AND APACHE INTERTRIBAL
LAND USE COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION NO. 00-10

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma are federally recognized Tribes with approved constitutions; and

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) is the duly authorized and delegated official body given the responsibility and authority by the three tribes to act on their behalf with respect to the care, maintenance and development of commonly owned tribal properties and resources; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) to accept the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas as follows:

(d) CONSTRUCTION—The compact shall not in any manner alter—(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest; (2) any tribal trust lands; (3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation; (4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and (5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal

Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) hereby approve and support the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing KCAILUC Resolution No. 00-10 was duly adopted at a Regular Monthly Meeting of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee held at the KCA Administration Office on July 12, 2000, by a vote of 6 For 1 Against 0 Abstain. A quorum being present and at least two representatives from each tribe concurring in the vote.

BILLY EVANS HORSE,
Chairman.

MELVIN KERCHIE, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.J. Res. 72, a Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Red River Boundary compact. This bipartisan legislation will re-enforce the eroding Red River south bank and establish a new boundary between the states of Texas and Oklahoma. The new boundary is a vegetation line that is not as susceptible to the forces of nature and is substantially the same as the gradient line used to originally determine the states' boundaries.

Initially, three tribal nations, the Kiowa, the Comanche, and the Apaches expressed concerns regarding this legislation's effect on the status of land from which the tribes derive oil and gas royalties. To remedy that issue, language, approved by officials from Texas, Oklahoma, the Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was put into the legislation confirming that neither the rights of the Indian nations nor the boundaries of the Indians lands will be altered by the compact.

I commend my colleagues for working together in a bipartisan manner to resolve this important issue and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 72, the Red River Boundary Compact, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Today, with Congressional consent the border dispute between Oklahoma and Texas that has existed for more than 100 years will come to an end.

The official boundary is currently the south bank of the Red River. However, the Red River constantly runs dry, which makes determining the south bank difficult. There was an obvious need for a new, more definitive way to determine the border.

In 1996, Oklahoma and Texas agreed upon creating a Red River Boundary Commission to solve this border dispute. In the last year, this commission released their findings and both Oklahoma and Texas state governments have agreed on this compromise. This agreement would clarify and affix the boundary between Oklahoma and Texas as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River. This agreement would mean that the Red River would be part of the State of Oklahoma, where it belongs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We need to put a stamp on this agreement which will end the Red River War, and I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 72.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, July 20, 2000:

H.R. 1791, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for harming animals used in Federal law enforcement;

H.R. 4249, to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in northern Europe.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NATIONAL MOTTO FOR GOVERNMENT OF A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 548) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the national motto for the government of a religious people, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the national motto of the United States is "In God we trust";

Whereas the national motto was adopted in 1956 and is codified in the laws of the United States at section 302 of title 36, United States Code;

Whereas the national motto is a reference to the Nation's "religious heritage" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668, 676 (1984));

Whereas the national motto recognizes the religious beliefs and practices of the American people as an aspect of our national history and culture;

Whereas nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration;

Whereas the national motto is deeply interwoven into the fabric of our civil polity;

Whereas the national motto recognizes the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded "under God";

Whereas the content of the national motto is as old as the Republic itself and has always been as integral a part of the first